



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,224	04/01/2004	David E. Richardson	100111157-1	5369

22879 7590 04/19/2010
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER

JAIN, RAJ K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2472

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/19/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/814,224	Applicant(s) RICHARDSON, DAVID E.	
	Examiner RAJ JAIN	Art Unit 2472	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-16,18-23 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-16,18-23 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Insert "by a processor" after determining in line 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-23, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al (USP 6,470,025) in view of Gulliford et al (USP 6,618,355 B1).

Regarding claim(s) 1, 9, 16 and 23, Wilson discloses a method of managing traffic in a first set of nodes of a computer network (fig. 1, VLANs 1, 2, 3) having a first set of nodes (Figs. 1 & 2 showing set of nodes for VLAN 1) and a second set of nodes (Vlan2 inherently has another set of nodes which is interpreted to be second set of nodes) comprising:

determining a source associated with an amount of network traffic over the first set of nodes (Fig. 1, col 2 lines 51-67; col 4 lines 9-15), the source being outside a group of network elements assigned to the first set of nodes (Fig. 1, col 3 line 60 – col 4 line 8).

Wilson fails to disclose determining top talker sources over the first VLAN and the second VLAN and VLAN identifiers respectively where the top talkers are not the same as the VLAN being tested and further fails to disclose displaying the source.

Gulliford discloses a first set of nodes and second set of nodes being a VLAN (Fig. 3; col 1 lines 30-45; col 6 line 61 – col 7 line 5; col 7 lines 19-25).

The virtual LAN (VLAN) standard allows for grouping nodes into Logical LAN groupings on a single fabric. In a VLAN environment, packets are assigned to a particular logical LAN and the packet is constrained to stay within that logical LAN. This ensures that unicast packets cannot be received outside of a particular grouping. Broadcast and multicast packets from a given node with a virtual LAN are similarly constrained to remain within the virtual LAN. The traffic containment that VLAN's provide, along with the controlled distribution of multicast packets, can permit a greater number of end nodes to be supported on a fabric. Gulliford further discloses top talkers as congestion based a billing criteria that exceed the thresholds of specific nodes (See Figs. 5a & 5b). Lastly, Gulliford inherently discloses displaying sources via appropriate computer monitors (Fig. 2, ref. 201A)

Thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gulliford within Wilson so as to contain traffic within a specific group and allow for network flexibility of future growth by adding additional communication and/or multimedia services as needed.

Regarding claim(s) 3, 11, 18 and 25, Wilson while does not explicitly disclose a user name associated with the source, however, Examiner asserts user name is well known in the arts by replacing specific IP addresses with MAC addresses.

Regarding claim(s) 4, 12, 19, and 26, Gulliford discloses reassigning the source to the first VLAN in response to determining the source either manually or automatic (col 7 lines 25-40). Reasons for combining same as for base claims.

Regarding claim(s) 5 and 27, Gulliford discloses automatic reassignment (col 7 lines 25-40). Reasons for combining same as for base claims.

Regarding claim(s) 6, 13, 20, and 28, Wilson discloses traffic data is obtained using a network management protocol (col 1 lines 7-24).

Regarding claim(s) Claims 7, 14, 21 and 29 Wilson discloses remote monitoring protocol (Figs 1 & 2, incorporate remote monitoring see abstract; col 1 lines 36-45; col 2 lines 51-67).

Regarding claim(s) 8, 15, 22, and 30, Wilson fails to disclose determining top talker sources over the first VLAN and the second VLAN and VLAN identifiers

respectively where the top talkers are not the same as the VLAN being tested and further fails to disclose displaying the source.

Gulliford discloses a first set of nodes and second set of nodes being a VLAN (Fig. 3; col 18 lines col 1 lines 30-45; col 6 line 61 – col 7 line 5; col 7 lines 19-25).

The virtual LAN (VLAN) standard allows for grouping nodes into Logical LAN groupings on a single fabric. In a VLAN environment, packets are assigned to a particular logical LAN and the packet is constrained to stay within that logical LAN. This ensures that unicast packets cannot be received outside of a particular grouping. Broadcast and multicast packets from a given node with a virtual LAN are similarly constrained to remain within the virtual LAN. The traffic containment that VLAN's provide, along with the controlled distribution of multicast packets, can permit a greater number of end nodes to be supported on a fabric. Gulliford further discloses top talkers as congestion based a billing criteria that exceed the thresholds of specific nodes (See Figs. 5a & 5b). Thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gulliford within Wilson so as to contain traffic within a specific group and allow for network flexibility of future growth by adding additional communication and/or multimedia services as needed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-23, and 25-30, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAJ JAIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raj K. Jain/

Examiner, Art Unit 2472